

# Open public consultation on the Evaluation of Regulation (EU) 913/2010 concerning a European rail network for competitive freight

*(Version for public familiar with the Rail  
Freight Corridors or with the European  
railway market or the (rail) freight  
transport sector)*

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Part I: Agreement on personal data and identification of the respondents

---

### Agreement on personal data

\*Please indicate your preference for the publication of your response on the Commission's website:  
(Please note that regardless the option chosen, your contribution may be subject to a request for access to documents under [Regulation 1049/2001](#) on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents. In this case the request will be assessed against the conditions set out in the Regulation and in accordance with applicable [data protection rules](#).)

- ☐ Under the name given (name of your organisation/company/public authority/association or your name if you reply as an individual): I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication.
- ☐ Anonymously: I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is subject to copyright restrictions that prevent publication.
- ☐ Please keep my contribution confidential. (it will not be published, but will be used internally within the European Commission)

\*May the Commission contact you, in case further details on the submitted information in this questionnaire are required?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

## Identification of the respondents

\*1. Please provide your first name

*100 character(s) maximum*

\*2. Please provide your last name

*100 character(s) maximum*

\*3. Please provide your email address

\*4. In what capacity are you completing this questionnaire?

- ☐ In a personal capacity  
☐ On behalf of an organisation, association, company, authority etc.

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation/company/public authority/association, please answer questions 5 to 9.

If you are responding in a personal capacity, please answer questions 10 to 11.

\*5. Please identify clearly which organisation / association / company / authority you represent?

*100 character(s) maximum*

\*6. Is your organisation registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

\*If yes, please enter the identification number (numbers only)

7. Please provide the address of your organisation / association / authority

200 character(s) maximum

\*8. Please specify your country/countries of operation/competence/activities – *multiple answers are possible.*

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> EU-wide                | <input type="checkbox"/> Global         | <input type="checkbox"/> Austria        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Belgium                | <input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria       | <input type="checkbox"/> Croatia        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cyprus                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Czech Republic | <input type="checkbox"/> Denmark        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Estonia                | <input type="checkbox"/> Finland        | <input type="checkbox"/> France         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Germany                | <input type="checkbox"/> Greece         | <input type="checkbox"/> Hungary        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ireland                | <input type="checkbox"/> Italy          | <input type="checkbox"/> Latvia         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lithuania              | <input type="checkbox"/> Luxembourg     | <input type="checkbox"/> Malta          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Netherlands            | <input type="checkbox"/> Poland         | <input type="checkbox"/> Portugal       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Romania                | <input type="checkbox"/> Slovenia       | <input type="checkbox"/> Spain          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sweden                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Slovakia       | <input type="checkbox"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |   |   |

Please specify "Other"

100 character(s) maximum

\*9. Which of the following categories best describes your activity or that of your members?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Ministry of Transport                    | <input type="radio"/> Public Authority (Regional, local, etc.) |
| <input type="radio"/> National safety authority                | <input type="radio"/> Regulatory body                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Infrastructure manager / Allocation Body | <input type="radio"/> Freight railway undertaking              |
| <input type="radio"/> Passenger railway undertaking            | <input type="radio"/> Non-railway undertaking applicant        |
| <input type="radio"/> Terminal                                 | <input type="radio"/> Service facility                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Port authority                           | <input type="radio"/> Shipper                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Forwarder                                | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal operator                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Logistic company                         | <input type="radio"/> Industry association                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Environment association                  | <input type="radio"/> Passenger association                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Research institution                     | <input type="radio"/> Think tank                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Consultancy                              | <input type="radio"/> Other                                    |

Please specify "Other"

100 character(s) maximum

\*10. If you reply in a **personal capacity**, please indicate your country of residence.

- |                                      |  |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Austria        | <input type="radio"/> Belgium                | <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria       |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia        | <input type="radio"/> Cyprus                 | <input type="radio"/> Czech Republic |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark        | <input type="radio"/> Estonia                | <input type="radio"/> Finland        |
| <input type="radio"/> France         | <input type="radio"/> Germany                | <input type="radio"/> Greece         |
| <input type="radio"/> Hungary        | <input type="radio"/> Ireland                | <input type="radio"/> Italy          |
| <input type="radio"/> Latvia         | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania              | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg     |
| <input type="radio"/> Malta          | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands            | <input type="radio"/> Poland         |
| <input type="radio"/> Portugal       | <input type="radio"/> Romania                | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia       |
| <input type="radio"/> Spain          | <input type="radio"/> Sweden                 | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia       |
| <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom | <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) |                                      |

Please specify "Other"

*100 character(s) maximum*

\*11. In case you answer in a **personal capacity**, which of the following categories best describes you?

- ☐ Interested citizen
- ☐ Casual rail passenger
- ☐ Frequent rail passenger
- ☐ Other

If Other, please specify

*100 character(s) maximum*

## Part II: Questionnaire

---

### 1. Rail freight

a) Which long term role should the railway system play for the transport of goods?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

b) In your opinion, should the rail freight transport absorb a part of the freight road transport?

- ☐ Yes, rail freight should absorb a large part of road freight transport
- ☐ Yes, rail freight should absorb a small part of road freight transport
- ☐ No, the current mix is adequate
- ☐ No, road freight should absorb a small part of rail freight transport
- ☐ No, road freight should absorb a large part of rail freight transport
- ☐ No opinion

## 2. Rail Freight Corridor concept

a) Do you consider the Rail Freight Corridor approach to be relevant in order to boost the competitiveness of rail freight and to achieve modal shift?

- ☐ Very relevant
- ☐ Relevant
- ☐ Slightly relevant
- ☐ Not relevant
- ☐ No opinion

If relevant, in your opinion should the Rail Freight Corridor concept be improved/further developed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

b) In your opinion, what is the contribution of the Rail Freight Corridors to cross-border rail freight **today** ?

- ☐ Very significant
- ☐ Significant
- ☐ Slightly significant
- ☐ Not significant
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

c) In your opinion, what could be the contribution of the Rail Freight Corridors to cross-border rail freight in the future ?

- ☐ Very significant
- ☐ Significant
- ☐ Slightly significant
- ☐ Not significant
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

1100 character(s) maximum

### 3. Challenges faced by rail freight

The challenges for European cross-border rail freight transport could be categorized as follows: a quality challenge (punctuality, reliability), a cost challenge (cost competitiveness), a service challenge (need for the introduction of new and innovative freight transport services), a political challenge (political and societal acceptance) and a European challenge (seamless crossing of borders).

a) Do you see any other main challenges faced by European cross-border rail freight?

1100 character(s) maximum

b) In your opinion, has the Rail Freight Corridor concept the potential to address these challenges?

	Very well addressed	Addressed	Hardly addressed	Not at all addressed	No opinion
QUALITY challenge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COST challenge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SERVICE challenge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
POLITICAL challenge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EUROPEAN challenge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please comment (in particular, if you listed other challenges in a), has the Rail Freight Corridor concept the potential to address these?)

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 4. Governance of the Rail Freight Corridors

##### a) Architecture and decision-making

(i) How appropriate do you consider that the architecture of the governance structure of the Rail Freight Corridors is?

- ☐ Very appropriate
- ☐ Appropriate
- ☐ Somewhat appropriate
- ☐ Not appropriate
- ☐ No opinion

(ii) In practice, how responsive is the current governance structure acting, e.g. to identify and tackle issues hampering cross-border rail freight in Europe?

- ☐ Very responsive
- ☐ Responsive
- ☐ Somewhat responsive
- ☐ Not responsive
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment and specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(iii) The Rail Freight Corridor Regulation foresees unanimity for the decisions of both the Executive Board and Management Board. Do you consider this unanimity principle appropriate to ensure an effective management of the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Very appropriate
- ☐ Appropriate
- ☐ Somewhat appropriate
- ☐ Not appropriate
- ☐ No opinion

**b) Effectiveness and commitment of the governance bodies**

(i) In your opinion, how effective are the Member States in promoting the implementation of the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Effective
- ☐ Somewhat effective
- ☐ Not effective
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(ii) In your opinion, how effective do you deem the Management board in performing its tasks?

- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Effective
- ☐ Somewhat effective
- ☐ Not effective
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(iii) In your opinion, how effective are the Advisory groups for railway undertakings and terminals in identifying issues important for the users of the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Effective
- ☐ Somewhat effective
- ☐ Not effective
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*



(iv) Please list, if any, some positive achievements and negative impacts of the work of the governance structure?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(v) In your opinion, do you think that it would be beneficial for the development of a Rail Freight Corridor if an independent European coordinator (not necessarily the corresponding Core Network Corridor coordinator), with political influence and negotiation experience, would chair its Executive Board, in order to push the corridor forward, for example by identifying the right issues to tackle and negotiating with the relevant Member States and Infrastructure Managers to pursue the corresponding actions needed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**c) Involvement of sector stakeholders**

(i) Do you consider that sector stakeholders are appropriately involved in the governance structure?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

if no, please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(ii) Currently the Regulation does not foresee a formal representation of the Advisory Groups within the Executive Boards or Management Boards (but does not forbid it). In practice some Executive Boards invite the spokesperson of the advisory groups to report, but this practice is not generally used. In your opinion, should representative(s) of the advisory groups attend the board meetings?

- ☐ Yes, through a permanent participation right
- ☐ Yes, depending on the issues on the agenda, through mandatory invitation from the board(s)
- ☐ Yes, depending on the issues on the agenda, through voluntary invitation from the board(s)
- ☐ No, it is not necessary

(iii) Currently the Regulation does not explicitly foresee the possibility for applicants that are not railway undertakings (non RU-applicants or "authorized applicants" according to Regulation (EU) 913/2010) to be members of the Advisory groups (but does not forbid it). Should the advisory groups be extended to non RU-applicants?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

(iv) Should the terminal managers and port authorities have an enhanced role in the governance structure?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, should they have a role in the Management Board?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### d) Working groups

In certain Rail Freight Corridors, working groups have been set up with relevant stakeholders (infrastructures managers, railway undertakings, ministry representatives, regulators, national safety authorities, the European Commission, the European Railway Agency, etc.), coming from different Member states.

(i) In your opinion, to what extent has the Rail Freight Corridor concept facilitated the setting-up of such working groups across borders?

- ☐ Very significantly
- ☐ Significantly
- ☐ Somewhat significantly
- ☐ Not significantly
- ☐ No opinion

(ii) In your opinion, to what extent are the working groups contributing to solve issues hampering cross-border rail freight?

- ☐ Very significantly
- ☐ Significantly
- ☐ Somewhat significantly
- ☐ Not significantly
- ☐ No opinion

**e) Involvement of public authorities**

Do you think that giving a formal role in the Rail Freight Corridors to further public authorities (such as the European Railway Agency and the National Safety Authorities) would bring an added-value?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, please explain which role?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**f) Dual Governance**

Some corridor sections belong to more than one Rail Freight Corridor which leads to situations of multiple governance.

Do you think that the Regulation should contain provisions on the division of competences between the Rail Freight Corridors concerned in the case of sections belonging to more than one Rail Freight Corridor?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**g) Monitoring of the operation of the Rail Freight Corridors**

(i) In case a stakeholder, e.g. a customer, complains about the functioning/operation of a Rail Freight Corridor, in your opinion to whom should this stakeholder direct its complaint:

- ☐ To the Executive Board
- ☐ To the Regulatory Body
- ☐ To the Management Board
- ☐ To the European Commission

Who should handle this complaint?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

Should the Regulation foresee powers of remedial actions in addition to the one already foreseen?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(ii) Today the Rail Freight Corridors tend to increase the cooperation among them; this cooperation is not mandatory (but has been set up between the RAGs, between the Management Boards, and between the Executive Boards): in your opinion should this kind of cooperation inter-Rail Freight Corridors be mandatory formalised?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

h) Do you have any other comment(s) on the governance structure of the Rail Freight Corridors?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## 5. Governance of Rail Freight Corridors and Core Network Corridors

Which benefits and/or disadvantages do you see in the involvement of the Rail Freight Corridors in the work of the TEN-T Core Network Corridors and vice-versa? Which form could this involvement take? How do you assess the current cooperation between the governance bodies of the Rail Freight Corridors and the Core Network Corridor fora and/or the corresponding coordinators?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## 6. Geographical definition of the Rail Freight Corridors

a) Do you consider that the geographical routes of the Rail Freight Corridors defined in the annex of the Regulation are relevant to meet the objective of the Rail Freight Corridor Regulation which is to boost the competitiveness of rail freight?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

b) Do you consider that the specific railway lines and terminals designated to the current Rail Freight Corridors are **relevant** to meet the objective of the Rail Freight Corridor Regulation which is to boost the competitiveness of rail freight?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

- c) Do you consider that the specific railway lines and terminals designated to the current Rail Freight Corridors are **sufficient** to meet the objective of the Rail Freight Corridor Regulation which is to boost the competitiveness of rail freight?
- ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No, there is a need to designate further lines/terminals
  - ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

- d) In your view, how significant should market needs be when designing the routes (the geographical definition specified in the annex of the Regulation, which does not specify specific railway lines) of the Rail Freight Corridors?
- ☐ Very significant
  - ☐ Significant
  - ☐ Somewhat significant
  - ☐ Not significant
  - ☐ No opinion

- e) In your view, how significant should market need be when designating railway lines or terminals to a Rail Freight Corridor?
- ☐ Very significant
  - ☐ Significant
  - ☐ Somewhat significant
  - ☐ Not significant
  - ☐ No opinion

- f) In relation to questions d) and e), which other criteria should be taken into account?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

- g) Do you see a need for procedures to modify the principal routes of the Rail Freight Corridors, e.g. removing route sections or merging of Rail Freight Corridors?
- ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**h)** The initial nine Rail Freight Corridors have been largely aligned with the [TEN-T Core Network Corridors](#) in terms of geographical definition, in order for the Rail Freight Corridors to form the rail freight backbone of the Core Network Corridors.

Which benefits and/or shortcomings do you see in this alignment between the Rail Freight Corridors and the TEN-T Core Network Corridors?

*1800 character(s) maximum*

## 7. Expected developments

Through the establishment of the Rail Freight Corridors, what developments did you expect in 2010 for the period 2010 – today? What do you expect in the short term, and by 2030?

a) in terms of reliability, punctuality, quality and efficiency of freight train services?

	Very positive developments	Positive developments	No developments	Negative developments	Very negative developments	No opinion
2010-today	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the short term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Over the period 2010-2030	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

b) in terms of traffic management?

	Very positive developments	Positive developments	No developments	Negative developments	Very negative developments	No opinion
2010-today	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the short term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Over the period 2010-2030	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

c) in the field of infrastructure development?

	Very positive developments	Positive developments	No developments	Negative developments	Very negative developments	No opinion
2010-today	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the short term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Over the period 2010-2030	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

d) in terms of capacity allocation procedures?

	Very positive developments	Positive developments	No developments	Negative developments	Very negative developments	No opinion
2010-today	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the short term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Over the period 2010-2030	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## 8. Punctuality and priority

**a)** The Regulation foresees the adoption of common targets for punctuality and/or guidelines for traffic management, and the drawing up of priority rules for the management of different types of traffic, in case of disturbances of train movements.

In case of disturbances, have you perceived a positive evolution with regard to **punctuality**?

- ☐ Yes, it has improved
- ☐ No changes are perceived
- ☐ No, it has worsened
- ☐ No opinion

In case of disturbances, have you perceived a positive evolution with regard to **traffic management**?

- ☐ Yes, it has improved
- ☐ No changes are perceived
- ☐ No, it has worsened
- ☐ No opinion

**b)** The Regulation lays down one concrete priority rule in the event of disturbance: the train path allocated to freight trains which comply with their scheduled time in the working timetable should not be modified, as far as possible.

**(i)** Do you consider this priority rule as appropriate?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

**(ii)** In practice, have you seen any effect of this rule?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

**c)** Do you think that strict punctuality targets and stronger priority rules should be promoted

**(i)** in the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Yes, more strongly
- ☐ It should remain as it is
- ☐ This should be less promoted
- ☐ No, this should not be promoted
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(ii) for international freight trains on any routes?

- ☐ Yes, more strongly
- ☐ It should remain as it is
- ☐ This should be less promoted
- ☐ No, this should not be promoted
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(iii) for freight trains in general (including national ones)?

- ☐ Yes, more strongly
- ☐ It should remain as it is
- ☐ This should be less promoted
- ☐ No, this should not be promoted
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

d) Do you think that priority rules should be harmonised among all the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion



Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

e) In your opinion, under which circumstances, should **passenger trains** have the priority over freight trains?

- ☐ All circumstances
- ☐ Specific circumstances
- ☐ None

If 'specific circumstances', please specify:

*1100 character(s) maximum*

f) In your opinion, under which circumstances, should **freight trains** have the priority over passenger trains?

- ☐ All circumstances
- ☐ Specific circumstances
- ☐ None

If 'specific circumstances', please specify:

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## 9. Traffic Management and coordination of works

a) Have you perceived developments due to the coordination of traffic management foreseen in the Regulation?

- ☐ Positive developments
- ☐ No changes
- ☐ Negative developments
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**b)** Do you think that the role of the Rail Freight Corridors regarding coordination of traffic management should be modified?

- ☐ It should be strengthened
- ☐ It should remain as it is
- ☐ It should be reduced
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**c)** How do you perceive the coordination of works (possessions) in the Rail Freight Corridors in practice?

- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Sufficient
- ☐ Not sufficient
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## **10. Infrastructure development**

**a)** Should the Rail Freight Corridors have a role in the implementation of the following infrastructure requirements laid down in Article 39 of Regulation 1315/2013 (to be implemented by 2030 on the Core Network): 740m train length, 22.5t axle load, electrification, 100 km/h speed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**b)** The deployment of European Railway Traffic Management System (to be implemented by 2030 on the Core Network) presupposes a close coordination between the deployment on the trackside and the on-board. Moreover some Rail Freight Corridors have merged with the so-called European Railway Traffic Management System Corridors.

In your opinion, should the Rail Freight Corridors have a particular role to play in the operational deployment of the European Railway Traffic Management System?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**c)** In your opinion, should the Rail Freight Corridors have a particular role to play in the deployment of any other infrastructure parameters (e.g. related to loading gauge)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Partly
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, please specify which ones:

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**d) Coordination of investments**

(i) How would you describe the added-value of the Rail Freight Corridors in terms of coordination of investments across borders?

- ☐ Very significant
- ☐ Significant
- ☐ Somewhat significant
- ☐ Not significant
- ☐ No opinion

(ii) Do you think that the role of the Rail Freight Corridors in terms of coordination of investments should be modified?

- ☐ It should be strengthened
- ☐ It should remain as it is
- ☐ It should be reduced
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**11. Small-scale investments**

Do you think that the Rail Freight Corridors should have access to dedicated financial resources, having the competence to take the decision for small-scale investments along the corridors?

*1400 character(s) maximum*

**12. Last-mile infrastructure**

a) Do you think that the Rail Freight Corridors should play a role in promoting the access to information about and development (capacity and investments) of last-mile infrastructure?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**b)** In your opinion, should the Rail Freight Corridors have a role in identifying the impacts of some investments along the Rail Freight Corridor infrastructure, on last mile infrastructures, and vice versa?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

### **13. Capacity offer**

**a)** How do you assess the amount of dedicated capacity (pre-arranged paths and/or reserve capacity) offered by the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Very satisfactory
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Somewhat satisfactory
- ☐ Not satisfactory
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**b)** How do you assess the quality of the capacity offered by the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Very satisfactory
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Somewhat satisfactory
- ☐ Not satisfactory
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

c) In your opinion, do national framework agreements, which have been concluded for freight or passenger national traffic, have an impact on the amount of capacity dedicated to the Rail Freight Corridor?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

d) If you are a user of the Rail Freight Corridors: if you have the choice between a pre-arranged path in the sense of the Regulation and paths of comparable quality allocated through the national procedures, , do you see an added value in choosing a pre-arranged path?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

e) Do you consider the pre-arranged path concept as being in line with market needs?

- ☐ Perfectly
- ☐ Largely
- ☐ Barely
- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

f) Do you consider it possible to reduce the timeline for the application to dedicated capacity on the RFCs **for prearranged paths**?

- ☐ Absolutely
- ☐ Largely
- ☐ Barely
- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ No opinion

Do you consider it possible to reduce the timeline for the application to dedicated capacity on the RFCs **for reserve capacity**?

- ☐ Absolutely
- ☐ Largely
- ☐ Barely
- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

g) In your opinion, should the timeline for the application to reserve capacity be harmonised among all Rail freight corridors?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

h) Do you see a need for a new concept for freight capacity allocation, e.g. ensuring at an early stage the reservation of capacity (e.g. time windows) of good quality for freight on the Rail Freight Corridors (and defining specific train paths only at a later stage, closer to the actual running of the train)?

- ☐ Yes, the prearranged path concept should be replaced by such a new concept
- ☐ Yes, such a new concept should complement the prearranged path concept
- ☐ No, the prearranged path concept is meeting the needs

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 14. Corridor One-Stop Shop (C-OSS)

A C-OSS is set up by the Management Board as single contact point for the users of the Rail Freight Corridor to request capacity for freight trains crossing at least one border.

a) In your opinion, does the concept of C-OSS bring an added value to European cross-border rail freight?

- ☐ Very high added value
- ☐ High added value
- ☐ Not much added value
- ☐ No added value
- ☐ No opinion

b) If you are an user of the Rail Freight Corridors: what is your experience in terms of contacts and use (including tools and procedures) of the C-OSS?

- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Bad
- ☐ Very Bad
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Not relevant

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

c) In your opinion, should the C-OSS offer include the possibility for users to request:

It does **not necessarily** mean that the C-OSS takes the corresponding allocation decision. Currently the Regulation does not explicitly specify that the C-OSS should offer to users this possibility (but does not forbid it).

(i) late request for prearranged path?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*



(ii) The modification and cancellation of paths?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(iii) National capacity?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(iv) Terminal capacity?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(v) Information about last-mile infrastructure?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(vi) Feeder and outflow paths?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(vii) Other?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

d) In your opinion, what should be the reserve capacity consist in?

(Several boxes may be ticked)

- ☐ Prearranged-paths
- ☐ Slots with a guaranteed windows time
- ☐ Flex Prearrange-path
- ☐ Tailor made solution
- ☐ Other

Please comment / specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

e) In your opinion should the C-OSS handle ad hoc requests for capacity other than reserve capacity?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

f) The current framework for capacity allocation foresees that the reserve capacity shall be requested to the C-OSS at least 30 days before the running day. In your opinion should this period be shortened for ad hoc requests (reserve capacity or other) to be requested closer to the running day of the train?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, until how many days? Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

g) Do you think that the C-OSS should deal with broader administrative processes like for example charging and billing?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

h) Do you consider that it should be possible to request via the C-OSS additional services like services at the stations,(e.g. parking or draining services, etc.)? (the current Regulation does not explicitly foresee it, but does not forbid it)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

i) In your opinion, would there be an added value if?

(i) the C-OSSs of the different Rail Freight Corridors cooperate more closely and jointly set up a single internet-based interface displaying the capacity for the entire network of Rail Freight Corridors and providing information concerning the use of the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(ii) The C-OSSs of all Rail Freight Corridors were merged into a single C-OSS?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

### 15. Performance

In your opinion, would it be beneficial to have targets to monitor the effectiveness of the Rail Freight Corridors as a tool to boost European rail freight? For instance in terms of traffic volumes or in terms of quality (e.g. punctuality and reliability) or in terms of infrastructure quality?

	Very beneficial	Beneficial	Disadvantageous	Very disadvantageous	No opinion
Traffic volumes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quality of the services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Infrastructure quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Have you any idea of other type of targets, the setting up of which would be beneficial to the Rail Freight Corridors?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

If you deem that the setting of such targets would be beneficial, how could they be defined, and by whom (e.g. by the Regulation, jointly by the governance bodies)?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 16. Disclosure of information to terminals

In your opinion, should the Regulation guarantee to terminals or other stakeholders the access to real-time train data concerning international freight trains, for example Estimated Time of Arrival (ETA)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please specify

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 17. Regulatory supervision

a) In your opinion, is the legal framework clear enough for the regulatory bodies to adequately perform their supervision of the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If no, please specify in which field?

- ☐ Scope of the competences
- ☐ Powers to take remedial action
- ☐ Distribution of competences between the Regulatory Bodies
- ☐ Other

b) Would you have any suggestion on how to improve the regulatory supervision?

*1400 character(s) maximum*

## 18. Language on the Rail Freight Corridors

Would you see an added value in having a single operational language:

a) on the cross-border sections until the first station/terminal on each side of the border?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If Yes, please specify for which staff category

*1100 character(s) maximum*

b) along the entire network of Rail Freight Corridors?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If Yes, please specify for which staff category

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## 19. Digital solutions

Do you see an added value in using the Rail Freight Corridors as a pilot vehicle for the deployment of innovative digital solutions and logistical applications?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No opinion

If Yes, please specify for which one and/or in which field

*1100 character(s) maximum*

## 20. Harmonisation

**a)** The European Commission has received a certain amount of feedback, both from Stakeholders inside the Rail Freight Corridors and from users of the Rail Freight Corridors, according to which the Rail Freight Corridors are suffering from a lack of harmonisation and of user-friendliness (e.g. concerning the Corridor information documents, terms and conditions, Frameworks for capacity allocation, Performance monitoring reports, deadlines, transport market studies, reporting procedures).

(i) Do you agree with this view?

- ☐ Fully agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Totally disagree
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

(ii) In your opinion, should the Regulation define minimum requirements for the structure and content of documents like the one mentioned above?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, please specify which ones

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**b)** In your opinion, should the tools, methods and processes developed and approved by RailNetEurope be systematically implemented by the Infrastructure Managers along the Rail Freight Corridors?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*



## 21. Terminology

Are you aware of any incoherencies or unclear terminology in the Regulation which would need to be better defined?

If so, please elaborate

*1800 character(s) maximum*

## 22. Efficiency

In your opinion, are the costs incurred for setting up, managing and making use of the Rail Freight Corridors by the stakeholders like the public authorities, the infrastructure managers, the railway undertakings or the terminal managers proportionate to the benefits of the Rail Freight Corridors for cross-border rail freight?

- ☐ Yes they are
- ☐ Yes they are but the benefits will start to be felt only in the mid-term
- ☐ Yes they are but the benefits will start to be felt only in the long term
- ☐ Partially
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1800 character(s) maximum*

## 23. Coherency with the EU Transport policy and legislation

a) Do you think that the objectives of the [Regulation](#) are coherent with the broader EU Transport policy, and in particular with the [White paper on Transport of 2011](#), which i.a. sets the objective to reduce CO2 emissions from transport by 60% by 2050 and to shift 30% of long-distance road freight to more energy-efficient transport modes by 2030 and 50% by 2050.

- ☐ Yes, to a large extent
- ☐ Yes, to a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

If yes, do you consider the Rail Freight Corridors, as specified in the current regulation, the right tools to contribute to the modal shift to rail?

Please comment

*1100 character(s) maximum*

b) Do you think that the objectives of the [Regulation](#) are coherent with the [TEN-T policy priorities set by the current European Commission in July 2014](#)?

- ☐ Yes, to a large extent
- ☐ Yes, to a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If no, please, explain why

*1100 character(s) maximum*

c) Do you think that the [Regulation](#) coherently fits in the current railway legislation (notably [Directive 2012/34/EU](#) establishing a single European railway area ('Recast')) and infrastructure development and financing legislation (notably the [TEN-T Guidelines](#) and the [CEF Regulation](#)) ?

- ☐ Yes, to a large extent
- ☐ Yes, to a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If no, please, explain why

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 24. Unexpected impacts

In your view, has the implementation of the Rail Freight Corridors had impacts that you did not initially expect?

- ☐ Yes, positive ones
- ☐ Yes, negative ones
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, please, explain which

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 25. Area of activities

In your opinion are there additional issues which are not yet covered by the Regulation (e.g. as regards interoperability, technical and operational barriers or noise mitigation), the tackling of which the Rail Freight Corridors could play a role in?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes, please, explain which

*1100 character(s) maximum*

#### 26. Barriers

Which operational and technical barriers should particularly be tackled in order to boost traffic on the Rail Freight Corridors, and more generally rail freight in Europe?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**27. Research and innovation**

**a)** In your opinion, which topics should particularly be tackled by research and innovation in order to boost the traffic on the Rail Freight Corridors, and more generally rail freight in Europe?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**b)** Do you see any specific innovation the rolling out of which would particularly benefit the Rail freight Corridors and more generally rail freight in Europe?

*1100 character(s) maximum*

**28. Any further suggestion**

Have you any other suggestion for the development of the Rail Freight Corridors?

*1800 character(s) maximum*